



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It is to be hoped that the anticipations raised by the title of Professor Case's book will be met in a second volume from his pen to which the present may serve as an introduction, and in which the development of early Christianity in the light of contemporary religious ideas and practices may be the principal theme. For such a book there is ample room. A great deal of work has been done by many scholars upon various matters of detail, and many early Christian practices and beliefs are now understood as they never were before, but there is need of renewed study, in the light of our larger knowledge of the ancient world, of the Christian movement as a whole and particularly of the entire complex of primitive Christian ideas. The present book is to be welcomed especially because it calls attention to this need.

ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

### SOURCE BOOKS FOR THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

The History of Religions Commission of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen has undertaken the publication of a series of texts from the sources. Franke's present contribution to this series, a translation of Suttas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 21, 26, 27, of the *Dīghanikāya*,<sup>1</sup> is an important addition to our knowledge of the language and content of the Pāli Tipiṭaka. The translation is excellent beyond criticism, and the very full notes show the most careful and conscientious scholarship.

In his introduction Franke tries to prove that the *Dīghanikāya* is not, as Buddhist tradition claims, a collection of the speeches of Buddha made immediately after his death but "ein einheitlich abgefasstes schriftstellerisches Werk" with the "Heilsweg-Schema als Mittelpunkt." In the Suttas emphasis is laid on the fact that the Way to Salvation was preached by a Tathāgata; concrete examples of Tathāgatas are given and Buddha is named as such a Tathāgata. The reiteration of this point in the Suttas themselves shows that the Suttas are not a collection of the speeches of Buddha himself although they may be ultimately based on such speeches. The long list of parallel passages collected by Franke and the stereotyped phraseology of the Suttas lend weight to this argument. In the main I agree emphatically with Franke's conclusions, but he pushes his theory to extremes. Why must we assume a single author? Plurality of authorship and the readaptation of older material

<sup>1</sup> *Dīghanikāya. Das Buch der langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons in Auswahl.* Translated by Otto Franke. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913. lxxix+360 pages. M. 14.

to a later viewpoint is possible and even probable. Franke is much too derogatory toward "the stupid scribblers" who are responsible for the stereotyped phraseology of the Suttas in their present form.

In discussing the authority of the Buddhist tradition Franke continues the same negative line of argument maintained in *JPTS* (1908), pp. 1-80. The evidence is as yet too fragmentary and contradictory to warrant dogmatism. Here Franke is much too skeptical and his criticism is too purely negative. Even if the Suttas in their present form are considerably later than Buddha, they may have preserved in a distorted way many elements of good historical tradition.

Twenty pages are devoted to a crushing criticism of Neumann's translation of the *Dīgha*. Careless work based on presuming ignorance warrants severe criticism but Franke shows almost too much animosity. The "der hier nicht einmal mit Namen genannt werden soll" of p. 179 might well have been spared.

With Franke's arguments against Garbe and his theory of a unified Sāṃkhya system earlier than Buddha (p. 22, n. 2, and p. 317) I fully agree. All recent investigations tend to show that the Darśanas as definite, unified systems grew up in schools and that the crystallization took place not in the pre-Christian but in the post-Christian period. There is no sufficient reason for considering that the Sāṃkhya system is an exception. The older point of view which assumes that the philosophical Sūtras are contemporaneous with the Sūtras of the Veda makes it necessary to believe that Hindu logic with all its complicated terminology sprang almost at once to perfection like Athene fully armed from the head of Zeus. That loose Sāṃkhya and Vedantic elements are prior to or contemporaneous with Buddha is not to be questioned, but that the Sāṃkhya existed as a fully developed system at that time or that the Vedānta, using the word to mean Advāita in its strict sense, is to be found in the Upanishads seems impossible. As yet there has been no satisfactory treatment of Indian philosophy from the historical and genetic point of view. So too all the treatments of Buddhism have been too hasty and based on insufficient material. All our books on Buddhism are destined soon to be superseded. No book gives any adequate description of Buddhism from this same historical and genetic point of view. For the most part our books paint Buddhism on the flat background of the Pāli Tipiṭaka which represents the interpretation of one sect. Perspective is lacking.

With Franke's conception of the meaning of Nirvāna in primitive Buddhism (p. 38, n. 5) I fully concur. Whatever the word meant to

later Buddhist thinkers, who in characteristic Indian fashion demanded a rationalistic and metaphysical background for the pragmatic ethics preached by Buddha, to Buddha himself and to the early Buddhists Nirvāna was merely the *summum bonum*, a state of passionlessness and peace to be reached even in this life. What happened after death was to Buddha a matter not tending to edification and not connected with religion.

Franke's treatment of the peyyālas is much better than that of Rhys Davids. From Franke's translation one can see exactly how much is repeated. Rhys Davids abbreviates and omits.

The collection of material in the appendices on the words Tathāgata, Arahāt, Bhikkhu, Samāṇa, and Saṃkhāra is linguistically important and valuable.

Admirable indexes of words, names, and subjects complete the book.

In another volume of this same series Hillebrandt<sup>1</sup> gives a translation, in whole or in part, of some 139 hymns of the Rig Veda. The hymns chosen form a fairly representative group and include all those of special literary interest. Comparatively few of the hymns to Agni and to Soma are chosen, hardly enough to give an adequate idea of the more ritualistic, technical, and hieratic aspects of Vedic worship. The notes, though good as far as they go, are not full enough to show the great linguistic difficulties of the text and the uncertainties of translation.

In stating the point of view from which the translation is made Hillebrandt says that the effort to interpret the Rig Veda from later commentaries and from the classical literature has failed; that it can no longer be regarded as a monument of Indo-European antiquity, and that the later ritualistic literature has little in common with the ritual of the Rig Veda. To this we must agree. The Rig Veda stands by itself and must be interpreted largely from itself. Yet comparative philology, the commentaries, and the later ritual are not to be discarded entirely. Each may yield help in unexpected places.

Adhering to ideas propounded in his *Vedische Mythologie* Hillebrandt looks to countries outside of India, to Arachosia and other parts of Central Asia, for the interpretation of many proper names (cf. Vorwort, pp. vi and 50). Although Hillebrandt does not go to the impossible extremes of Brunnhofer's theories about the composition of the Rig Veda yet the statements on p. 50 are made with altogether too little reserve.

<sup>1</sup> *Lieder des Rigveda*. Translated by Alfred Hillebrandt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913. xii+152 pages. M. 5.

His suggestion of the possibility of a connection of the Kaṇva family with the Aryan tribe assumed, on the basis of the inscriptions found at Boghazkeui, to have been located in Armenia in the 15th century B.C. is very hazardous. As yet the Boghazkeui evidence means nothing for the interpretation of the Rig Veda. The transcription of the names themselves is still uncertain and even if the transcription be correct the names may not be Aryan. We know as yet too little of the Hittite and Mittanian languages and name elements. The words may contain perfectly good Hittite or Mittanian elements. Only when we know the Hittite and Mittanian languages thoroughly will we have the right to be dogmatic. Altogether too much has been built on a very weak foundation by Semitic scholars. The names have not yet been subjected to any rigorous philological criticism. Hillebrandt might have referred to at least a few of the many contradictory articles in which the Boghazkeui and the Tell el-Amarna names have been discussed.

In his treatment of the so-called Ākhyāna or dialogue hymns Hillebrandt follows a weakly conciliatory method. Some hymns he treats as dramas, others as dialogues with omitted prose. In spite of the articles of Oldenberg, von Schroeder, Winternitz, Sieg, and Hertel I am unconvinced of the validity of either theory. It seems to me that we have in these hymns, not a prototype of the drama or of the mixed style in prose and verse found later in the Jātakas and the Pañcatantra but a prototype of the epic. They may be rude ballads. They require nothing but a detailed knowledge of the story to make them perfectly intelligible.

Here too as in his *Vedische Mythologie* Hillebrandt assigns to the moon too great a place in Vedic mythology. Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati, Apām Napāt, and Soma are all to be connected with a moon ritual. It may be so, but too little reserve is shown in the statement of his own theory.

WALTER E. CLARK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF PENANCE

The study of the origins of penance is fundamental in the study of the church, whether that be considered divinely founded or as the creation of man in the effort to satisfy his highest need. Closely involved with this study are a number of other important questions, such as the standards of conduct of the Christian group, the enforcement of these standards, authority in the group, the development of the clergy as a ruling class, the growth of the power of the keys—in fact, the very